

REMARKS

Claim 1, 3, 4 and 6 have been amended to further clarify the present invention. Support for the claim amendments can be found at FIGS. 3 and 4 of the present invention.

Claims 1-6 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Again, in the Office Action mailed March 10, 2005, the reference AG, Japanese Patent Application Laid-open No. 59-159498 was not considered by the Examiner because a translation thereof was not provided. However, the Information Disclosure Statement filed September 17, 2003 states that in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98, a concise explanation of what is presently understood to be the relevance of each non-English language publication is set forth in the application. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that at page 4 of the Specification, a concise explanation of what is presently understood to be the relevance of reference AG is set forth. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider this reference.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY GRIFFIS (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,683,432):

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a controller to control the robot, the controller comprising: a unit connecting and interrupting power supply to the servomotor which drives the specified apparatus, provided for each specified apparatus, an emergency stop unit receiving a notice of operator's approach or entry from the detection unit to bring the robot system into an emergency stopped state, wherein power supply to the robot and to each specified apparatus is interrupted, and a monitoring unit for each specified apparatus to monitor a connection state and an interruption state of power supply to the servomotor which drives the specified apparatus, and canceling the notice from the detection unit to the emergency stop unit, for the specified apparatus when the power supply is interrupted".

Griffis fails to disclose "**a controller comprising...an emergency stop unit** receiving a notice of operator's approach or entry from the detection unit to bring the robot system into an emergency stopped state, wherein power supply to the robot and to each specified apparatus is interrupted, and a monitoring unit for each specified apparatus to monitor a connection state and an interruption state of power supply to the servomotor which drives the specified apparatus, and **canceling the notice from the detection unit to the emergency stop unit, for the**

specified apparatus when the power supply is interrupted,” as recited in amended claim 1, for example.

In contrast, Griffin discloses a safety circuit for monitoring a number of sensors for intrusion of objects or people into a workspace of a robot. The safety circuit monitors a motion control system, and controls the drive power to the motion control system via an emergency-stop circuit (see column 4, lines 42-46; and FIG. 2, for example). Griffin discloses two types of intrusions, a precautionary type and a serious type (i.e., Intrusion Level 2 and Intrusion Level 1, respectively). As shown in FIG. 2, for example, the emergency-stop circuit 12 of Griffis is not included in the motion control system 11.

In addition, at page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the intrusions sensors 13 and 41 shown in FIG. 4 of Griffis are comparable to the Applicants’ “monitoring unit,” as recited in claim 1, for example. Thus, the Examiner asserts that these sensors 13 and 41 cancel a notice to the emergency-stop circuit 12, when power has been interrupted.

However, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. As mentioned above, Griffis fails to disclose “a monitoring unit for each specified apparatus to monitor a connection state and an interruption state of power supply to the servomotor which drives the specified apparatus, and **canceling the notice from the detection unit to the emergency stop unit, for the specified apparatus when the power supply is interrupted,”** as recited in claim 1, for example. That is, in Griffis the sensors 13 and 41 do not cancel a notice to the emergency stop unit 12 when the power is interrupted. Instead, as shown in FIG. 4, the sensors 13 and 41 merely return sensory data to a respective safety micro 10 or 41, and the respective safety micro monitors each other and makes sure that the respective sensors 13 and 41 are working properly.

Further, at page 2, of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Griffis discloses “canceling the notice,” as recited in claim 1, for example, at column 11, lines 55-65. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that this cited portion of Griffis discloses a recovery from a safety circuit fault which is unrelated to “canceling the notice...when the power supply is interrupted,” as recited in claim 1, for example.

Accordingly, the teaching of Griffis is fundamentally different from that of the present invention.

Claims 3 and 6 recite similar features as those of amended claim 1.

Thus, although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

II. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.


Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

7/27/2006

By:


Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501